



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EDITORIAL NOTES

Traitors and Treason.

According to section 3, article III, of the Constitution of the United States, "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

In his address to Congress of April 2, 1917, President Wilson made clear the distinction between friend and foe, ally and enemy. He said: "Our object now is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth ensure the observance of those principles."

Loyal citizens of this country, then, are those who are vindicating the principles of peace and justice and helping to set up a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth ensure the observance of those principles. Our enemies are the proponents of selfish and autocratic power and the foes of the principles of peace and justice as governing the life of the world. There would seem to be no possible misunderstanding of this matter. It would seem possible to recognize, according to this definition, our true enemies, and those who support them, whether they are in our midst or within the confines of the Central Powers.

The horse-whipping of Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow by a gang of masked men is a case in point. We are not in position to argue in defense of Dr. Bigelow, lacking the necessary facts. For the sake of the argument that we do make, we are willing to grant, if desired, that his utterances, which are claimed to be the provocation of this exhibition of selfish and autocratic power and the subversion of the principles of peace and justice, were treasonable. Whatever Dr. Bigelow may be or may not be, the important point is, that men who take the law into their own hands, who arbitrarily violate the provision of the Constitution of the United States for trial and punishment of those guilty of "capital or otherwise infamous crime," who make that very democracy for which we fight today a byword and a laughing stock, who in such ways mock justice and enthrone lawlessness, are, at this time and in the light of our President's statement of our purposes, traitors against the United States, its people and its Government. They are guilty of adherence to our definitely stated enemies, and in that sense are guilty of giving them aid and comfort.

We believe that this statement would be corroborated by any impartial court of law and a verdict rendered accordingly under the interpretation of treason as defined

in the Constitution. Ignorant men may have believed that in joining the band of traitors who attacked Dr. Bigelow they were "doing their bit." It would be well, not in rhetorical figures of speech, but in downright language and practical action of law, that they should be shown their mistake—shown that "the bit" that they did in the Kentucky woods across the river from Cincinnati was done for our enemies' benefit; that it was unmistakable treason, and punishable as such.

The Rose and the Pole-cat.

We uttered last month a sincere, if quiet, plea for a concert of minds on the problem of finding a more truly representative name for the members of this Society and those who are in harmony with them than the name "pacifist," or its somewhat more etymologically righteous variant "pacifcist." Much advice upon this matter that would without doubt be instructive, enheartening and inspiring has so far been withheld by our readers. If without any authority we were arbitrarily to adopt a new name, we have no doubt that a flood of advice in the shape of criticism would forthwith pour in upon us. Yet if the necessity appears, we must dare the deluge. May we not again invite our readers to do their worst now, while decision still hangs in the balance?

In one sense the thing, and not the name, is of the first importance, of course. If we are engaged in supporting our Government, revealing the meaning of the war for all those who intelligently hope for the foundation and construction of a durable peace, working with our President and our nation for our common ideals—these things reveal us better than any label can reveal us. As *Juliet* in her girlish optimism declares: "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet." Yet a label has its value, too. If the rose is advertised by its smell alone, it fares well. If, however, it is advertised by its name, and that name happens to be "pole-cat," it fares not so well. The name "pacifist," even as the name ADVOCATE OF PEACE, has become "pole-cat" to a great number of people who have not yet had opportunity to become acquainted with the true fragrance of constructive thinking in behalf of an international organization founded on freedom and justice. Therefore, we are inclined to take issue with *Juliet* upon this point, maintaining that the connotation of a name should rightly harmonize with the meaning of the thing it labels. If "pacifist" is no longer "rose," but "pole-cat," it is not unseemly to desire a change in our label. If ADVOCATE OF PEACE is no longer "lilac," but "asa-fœtida," it may well be time to choose a name as little offensive to the nostrils as our purposes are to the hearts of honest, patriotic Americans.

On another page a writer, in an article entitled "Patriotic Internationalism vs. Obstructionism," makes clear the five fallacies of that sort of "peace" movement with which the name "pacifist" has unfortunately lately come to be identified. These are: (1) neutrality (as inconsistent with internationalism), (2) national isolation, (3) obstructionism, (4) class war, and (5) non-nationalism. The writer suggests as the proper label for that "pacifism" which is not falling into any of these fallacies, "Patriotic Internationalism." There is much to be said for and against such a title. Again we cordially invite our readers to say it.

Who's to Pay the Bill?

Opposition to a proposal emanating from certain sources in Russia, that the costs of the war be paid by an international fund contributed by all the nations proportionately to their war expenses, betrays a seeming unanimity of view in this country. Horror is expressed that we and the rest of the Allies should be called upon to pay for the destruction wreaked by Germany. Or, as one writer puts it:

They would tax every nation in the war. In other words, Germany would escape payment for all the pillage, all the wanton destruction she has inflicted on the hapless Belgian people, to say nothing of parts of France. Will the Allies ever agree to this? Not until they are fit to be slaves.

This is fine-sounding, but based upon vacuity of thought. It cannot be too often insisted upon, that the Germany after the war will not be the Germany of today, unless the Allies meet defeat, which is unthinkable. Allied victory means the end of Prussianism, and Germany without Prussianism is a new Germany, a brother-nation of all the progressive, free nations of the earth. Shall that Germany pay for the sins of its greatest enemy, Prussian Germany? As well call the Russian Republic to accounting for the sins of the Empire. The Russian plan for a general indemnity fund may not prove feasible, but not justly on the ground of this unthinking objection to it. Are we to release the captive from bondage only to crush him under the burden of his captor's sins? Would he not rightly prefer his chains to such a freedom? It is time to begin thinking what we are about, and not to talk incoherently and without meaning, in such a way as to imply direct contradiction to our high-sounding aims in this war.

A German Jumping-Off Place.

Once it was "a place in the sun," now it is "a jumping-off place for our navy," in the words of Count zu Reventlow, to be found at length on page 314 of this issue. It is significant, at a time when a score of

nations are seeking that state of international organization in which free nation may exist in peace and prosperity beside free nation, that this spokesman of the German Government should deliver an address upon war aims in which no hint or suggestion of so simple and just a purpose may be found. "Freedom of the seas" does not mean to him even an equal use of the sea in wartime. It means no less than such provisions as "*reasonably to guarantee ourselves the command of the seas in war.*"

Now it may be said that, in abstract equity, Germany has as much right to exercise this privilege in the future as England has to exercise it at this moment. The fact is, however, that England's exercise of dominion over the seas has been to the benefit of all nations these many decades past, and that Germany has never shown any indication of so public-spirited a service. In a free society of free nations, if sea dominion is to be exercised by any one nation, it must obviously be by that nation which reveals only the desire to benefit others as itself. Germany can win this right away from England, but not at the point of the sword. Her only opportunity to do so is by convincing the world that in exercising such mastery she would be the better servant of all. There will be no peace possible with the German Government or with the German people until this fact is grasped in all its significance. The essence of democracy is "power to those who serve." The old belief in "power to those who master" is dead. When Germany consents to bury the corpse, peace will be possible.

All that glitters as reform is not the gold of impartial justice. For example, Hungarian franchise reform, say reports, would divide Transylvania, regarded as the stronghold of Hungarian Roumanians, into sixty-four constituencies, of which not more than four will yield a Roumanian majority. This gerrymandering generosity is doubtless due to the fact that no good arrangement could be provided conveniently which would entirely eliminate the influence of the Roumanians in the determination of their own affairs.

Fact One: In one of our Middle Western States they are raising funds for a million-dollar reward for the Kaiser, alive or dead. Fact Two: In Indiana *Associated Advertising* writes: "It is a time for the thinking of big thoughts." Conclusion: There is work for each of us these days, whatever his standard of mentality.